

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached drawing sheet includes changes to Fig. 6. The change to Fig. 6 is discussed in the Remarks.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

Claims 2-19, 25, 28, 29, 31 and 32 are pending. Claims 1, 20-24, 26, 27 and 30 have been canceled. Claims 10 and 13 have been allowed. The applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Figure 6 has been amended to designate the recess with a reference number. That is, reference number 18k has been added to a lower right part of Fig. 6 to identify the recess. The specification has also been amended to mention the recess 18k. This change does not involve new matter, since the recess was illustrated in the original specification.

Claims 27 and 30 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim but were said to be allowable if written in independent form. Claims 27 and 30 have been incorporated in their respective base claims (17 and 25). Therefore, claims 17 and 25 are now considered to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 2, 3, 4, 11, 15, 17, 25, 28, 29, 31 and 32 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Kotlarski. The applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn for the following reasons.

Independent claim 17 is considered to be in condition for allowance, as mentioned above. Claims 2, 3, 4, 11, 15, 28, 29 depend on claim 17 and are thus likewise considered to be in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 25 is considered to be in condition for allowance for the reason given above. Claims 31 and 32 depend on claim 25 and are thus likewise considered to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-4, 11, 12, 14, 17 and 25 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mueller in view of DeBlock and Kotlarski. The applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn for the following reasons.

Independent claim 25 is considered to be in condition for allowance for the reason given above.

Independent claim 17 is considered to be in condition for allowance, as mentioned above. Claims 2-4, 11, 12, 14, 28 and 29 depend on claim 17 and are thus likewise considered to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 5-9 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kotlarski in view of Bauer et al. However, claims 5-9 depend on claim 17 and are thus considered to be in condition for allowance for the reason given above.


Claims 16 and 19 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mueller in view of DeBlock and Kotlarski and Breesch. However, claims 16 and 19 depend on claim 17 and are thus considered to be in condition for allowance for the reason given above.

Entry of this amendment is respectfully requested because the amendment involves canceling claims and combining dependent claims with their base claims. Thus, no new issues are presented.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. A timely notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If questions relating to patentability remain, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone.

If there are any problems with the payment of fees, please charge any underpayments and credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-1147.

Respectfully submitted,



James E. Barlow
Reg. No. 32,377

Posz Law Group, PLC
12040 South Lakes Drive, Suite 101
Reston, VA 20191
Phone 703-707-9110
Fax 703-707-9112
Customer No. 23400